



**DEPARTMENT OF PERSONNEL**

209 E. Musser Street, Room 101  
Carson City, Nevada 89701-4204  
(775) 684-0150  
[www.state.nv.us/personnel/](http://www.state.nv.us/personnel/)

**MEMO PERD #17/04**

May 19, 2004

TO: Interested Parties  
FROM: Jeanne Greene, Director  
Department of Personnel  
SUBJECT: PERSONNEL COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

---

Attached are the minutes from the March 19, 2004, Personnel Commission meeting. These minutes have not been approved and are subject to revision at the next meeting of the Personnel Commission on June 25, 2004.

JG:sq

Attachment

cc: Agency Personnel Liaisons  
Agency Personnel Representatives

**PERSONNEL COMMISSION  
MEETING MINUTES OF MARCH 19, 2004**

I. Call to Order

Chairman Claudette Enus called the meeting to order at 9:01 a.m., March 19, 2004, at the Legislative Building, 401 S. Carson Street, Carson City, with video conferencing to the Grant Sawyer Building, Las Vegas. Members present: Chairman Claudette Enus and Commissioners David Sánchez, Jack Eastwick and Katherine Fox. Also in attendance were James Spencer, Senior Deputy Attorney General, and Jeanne Greene and Carol Thomas from the Department of Personnel. Commissioner David Read was absent.

II \*Adoption of Agenda

Commissioner Fox's motion to adopt the agenda was seconded by Commissioner Sánchez and unanimously carried.

III. \* Adoption of Minutes of the previous meeting

The minutes of the December 19, 2003, meeting were unanimously approved.

IV. \*Classes Subject to Pre-employment Screening of Controlled Substances

*Department of Human Resources -  
Mental Health Technician series  
Developmental Support Technician series*

Kareen Masters, Personnel Officer, Department of Human Resources, requested pre-employment drug screening be conducted for both the Mental Health and Developmental Support Technician series. Incumbents in these classes assist in implementing treatment plans and daily living skills as well as numerous other areas related to client care.

Commissioner Sánchez's motion to approve the classes for pre-employment screening was seconded by Commissioner Fox and unanimously approved.

Commissioner Enus took a moment to recognize Commissioner Skaggs who had recently retired and welcomed newly appointed Commissioner Jack Eastwick.

V. \*Approval of Proposed Class Specifications

- A. Wildlife Area Technician III
- B. Chief Insurance Examiner

Mary Day, Supervisory Personnel Analyst, Department of Personnel, requested approval of the class specification for Wildlife Area Technician III, which had been modified to reflect

current responsibilities of the positions. She stated the class concept for Wildlife Area Technician III had been broadened to describe a position that functions with greater independence than other positions in the class.

With regard to the Wildlife Area Technician specification, Commissioner Sánchez noted that the specification referenced the use of a helicopter and inquired if the Wildlife Area Technician engaged in any hazardous duties. Ms. Day believed game counts were conducted in helicopter, and those technicians received an extra 10% hazardous duty pay when a helicopter was required.

Commissioner Fox's motion to approve the changes was seconded by Commissioner Sánchez and unanimously approved.

Ms. Day stated the minimum requirements for Chief Insurance Examiner had been modified to reflect the current certification requirements for management positions.

Commissioner Fox's motion to approve was seconded by Commissioner Sánchez and unanimously approved.

VI. \*Classification Appeals

David J. Young and Enrique G. Lancanilao, Computer Network Specialist I's  
*Office of the Attorney General*

Mr. Young stated that although he disagreed with the findings of Ms. Greene, he was appreciative of her hard work. He indicated that he had reviewed many *Work Performance Standards* (WPS) from various agencies, which compared to the duties he often performed and Computer Network Specialist is often used as a "catchall". He explained that although his WPS defined the locations and duties performed for the Nevada Attorney General's Office, he had Enterprise Server and Wide Area Network (WAN) responsibility throughout the network. He contended that agencies in support of the Department of Personnel's position to deny the appeal were either reluctant or had refused to supply work performance standards, using the argument that the small number of CNS II positions within their departments was related to the number of users supported.

Mr. Young related that a coworker was absent due to training and military duties and was unable to perform his duties as a Computer Network Specialist III. He, as well as others, have had to backfill and perform the coworker's duties, which included maintaining servers and routers, in addition to their own. He stated that the scope and complexity of the Attorney General's Office supported the need for an upgrade and such an upgrade would not create inequities among other State agencies. He thanked the Commissioners for their attention.

Mr. Lancanilao reiterated that the scope of responsibilities were comparable to those of the Computer Network Specialist II and indicated that his supervisor also believed they both met those concepts. Both he and Mr. Young introduced their supervisor, Charles Moltz, Data Processing Manager I, who stated that in 2001 he had been contacted by Peggy Martin, Personnel Analyst for the Department of Personnel, to participate as a panel member on a

Subject Matter Expert Committee for a study of the Computer Network Specialist series. Although informed there was no appetite or funding for a complete series review, three meetings were conducted. It was determined by the committee that the only way to save the series was to allow those individuals who were specialists and those who met the general overall concept into the series. After these meetings, he drafted the Work Performance Standards, believing duties contained therein were all within the series concept.

Commissioner Enus asked where he believed there was a divergence of his view of the positions and the ultimate position taken by the consultant committee group. Mr. Moltz replied that many WPS were assembled and submitted and said those submitted by the appellants were comparable. He indicated there were differences in the Computer Network Specialist I and II levels with level I being under direct supervision and level II falling under general supervision. An incumbent moving from direct supervision to general supervision and who met all the general requirements of a higher level should be qualified for that higher level. He believed both Mr. Young and Mr. Lancanilao met the qualifications and the intent for the level requested.

Mr. Young explained that by State standards, he met all the qualifications for Computer Network Specialist II and he was currently on a list for consideration for Computer Network Specialist II in other agencies. He believed his current position warranted an upgrade, as the duties performed were as complex as in other agencies.

Commissioner Sánchez commented that while conducting a classification study, the position, not the individual, should be reviewed. He asked about the process used by the Department of Personnel in their determination to deny the appellants' consideration for an upgrade. He believed that concern with the entire series as presented by Mr. Moltz was an issue for another time. Mr. Moltz reiterated that the series was in need of a review because of discrepancies therein.

Commissioner Sánchez asked what position Mr. Moltz had held previous to his current position. Mr. Moltz responded that he was performing duties as a Computer Network Specialist III and that he had expressed concern at the time regarding the series.

Peter Long, Supervisory Personnel Analyst, Department of Personnel, began by introducing Jon Mathews, Computer Operations Manager, Department of Information Technology, and Janice Rhode, Data Processing Manager, Department of Employment, Training and Rehabilitation. Mr. Long stated the request for an upgrade was denied due to lack of significant change and described the process utilized in conducting a study on information technology positions. He stated there were currently 589 positions allocated to 39 different information technology classes. Due to the highly technical and constantly evolving nature of information technology, a committee with expertise in this area had been formed to act as consultants and provide input on the classification of positions. The expertise provided by this committee was crucial in aiding the department in correctly classifying positions and ensuring consistency in alignment and equity in classes across department lines. The committee consists of information technology managers from large departments with large information technology staff. The managers have an in-depth knowledge of the duties and responsibilities involved with information technology and how the positions function, not

only within their own departments, but throughout State service. The committee discusses the duties of appellants appearing before them and recommends an appropriate classification to the Department of Personnel. He indicated that Mr. Young and Mr. Lancanilao had presented their current duties before the committee twice. Input from the committee was based on their knowledge of networks within various agencies and the classification of positions used to support the networks. The committee had determined the appellants' duties and responsibilities, consequence of error, and authority to act were consistent with their current classification of Computer Network Specialist I. Mr. Long added that the committee did not believe the network at the Attorney General's Office was at a level of complexity that justified additional Computer Network Specialist IIs to provide support and this input was a factor in his decision.

Continuing, Mr. Long stated that although the incumbents had obtained additional experience and training, it was not a valid reason for reclassification. However, it did provide for advancement into higher-level positions through recruitment.

Commissioner Sánchez asked when the series had last been studied. Mr. Long replied new specifications had been implemented in 1997 based on an occupational study conducted in 1995-96. He pointed out that a Workforce Planning Committee had been established that was in the process of reviewing class specifications for the computer series. This group will be making a recommendation to the Department of Personnel regarding which series should be involved in an occupational group study. The recommendation was expected shortly. Mr. Long added the Department recognized the class specifications were not as specific as they could be, and that was the main reason the Workforce Planning Committee had requested the review.

Commissioner Fox requested Mr. Long to expand on the issue of complexity; Mr. Long deferred to Mr. Mathews. Mr. Mathews explained the complexity issue came with the size of the network. He explained that the Department of Information Technology (DOIT) maintained some of the most complex networks Statewide, including the Silvernet WAN system, and the Computer Network Specialist IIs managed more than 100 devices Statewide, sometimes on a 24-hour, 7-day a week basis. Mr. Young disagreed with the presumption that complexity equals size as other agencies oftentimes maintained contract employees. He explained that his department dealt with similar issues and more protocols and that DOIT had simplified their protocols.

Commissioner Enus commented the two appellants had concentrated on speaking towards their WPS and compared their performance with those of Computer Network Specialist IIs. Mr. Mathews explained that he did not believe the Computer Network Specialist Is at the Attorney General's Office were comparable to the Computer Network Specialist IIs at DOIT due to the major difference of the two networks.

When Chairman Enus asked Mr. Young to describe the three most significant changes associated with his position, he replied with the following: 1) a move from direct to general supervision and the ability to perform duties with minimal consequence of error; 2) Network growth and complexity associated with such growth (e.g. managing the WAN, routers, servers, combating viruses); 3) additional positions due to increased network complexity.

Speaking to the issue of outside computer contractors, Janice Rhode, Data Processing Manager, DETR, stated the only contractors utilized by their department were for specific projects; however, no work on the network was performed by those contractors.

Mr. Long clarified that Work Performance Standards were not used for comparison purposes because they can be very specific or very generic. Significant change was based on the review of the position through the NPD-19 process.

Although both Chairman Enus and Commissioner Sánchez agreed there had been technological advancements in information technology, and that the appellants were performing additional duties associated with such advancements, Mr. Long had conducted the classification study properly within the scope of classification procedures. Chairman Enus added that although it appeared the appellants had increased their overall level of expertise and capabilities with additional training and qualifications, those things in and of themselves were not sufficient to uphold the appeals.

Commissioner Sánchez's motion to deny the appeals was seconded by Commissioner Eastwick and unanimously approved.

VII. \*Approval of Occupational Group Study Revised Class Specifications

A. Engineering & Allied occupational group

1. Professional Engineering subgroup

- a. Deputy State Engineer
- b. Chief, Hearings Section

Mary Day, Supervisory Personnel Analyst, Department of Personnel, requested approval of class specifications reviewed and revised through the occupational group study process. She explained there had been fairly minor changes including a title change to the Deputy State Engineer from Assistant State Engineer, and clarification to the minimum qualifications to Chief, Hearings Section, which included licensure as a Registered Professional Engineer.

Commissioner Fox's motion to approve the changes to both specifications was seconded by Commissioner Sánchez and unanimously approved.

B. Mechanical & Construction occupational group

1. Graphics, Printing & Reproduction Subgroup

- a. Sign Fabricator
- b. Reprographics Supervisor
- c. Microfilm Laboratory Technician
- d. Camera/Plate Processing Technician
- e. Sign Production Supervisor

- f. Silk Screen Printer
- g. Sign Writer

2. Facility & Grounds Management subgroup

- a. Administrator, Buildings & Grounds

Ms. Day explained that the aforementioned classes had been updated to reflect current terminology.

Commissioner Sánchez's motion to approve the proposed changes was seconded by Commissioner Eastwick and unanimously approved.

VIII. Uncontested Classification Action Report

No vote required.

IX. \*Hearings Officers' Contracts

Chairman Enus asked the attending Hearings Officers, two in the north, Pat Dolan and Henry Egghart, and one in the south, Angela Cartwright, to provide brief biographies, as well as an overview on the types of cases heard in the last 12 to 18 months. Mr. Hussey was not present.

Mr. Dolan stated he had been a Hearings Officer since 1977. He was a city/county manager; served as a personnel analyst with the State in 1968; coached in Winnemucca; attended law school and went into private practice in 1973; and was involved in numerous public labor unions. He stated that although the number of hearings has varied over the years, the highest number of cases he had heard was 60. Most years, he conducts around 30-45 hearings. Over half of his cases settle before coming before the hearings officer. He provided an overview of some of the cases he has been assigned. He explained how a whistleblower case was resolved during the discovery process. Seven of his cases were current and not considered backlog.

Mr. Egghart stated he was an alternate hearings officer for the north; was an attorney in private practice; and had worked for the Supreme Court for 11 years as a law clerk and then staff attorney. Concerning hearings, one-third of his cases had settled. Two cases were currently pending.

Ms. Cartwright provided information pertaining to her background which included an internship for a federal district judge; associate for 5 years in a private labor law firm; and practicing administrative law. She has been in private practice for 15 years. She commented she found being a hearings officer quite challenging and enjoyable. Concerning her cases, she explained about one-third of her cases settle and that of nineteen matters pending: three were pending written decisions; two were pending due to district court matters; two were pending settlement; she was awaiting reply on a couple cases before rendering her decision;

and a couple of hearings had been settled but have since been put back on her calendar. She commented the decision rendered at her last hearing was 50 pages in length.

Commissioner Fox's motion to extend Mr. Dolan's contract for another 2 years was seconded by Commissioner Sánchez and unanimously approved.

In regards to Mr. Egghart's contract, Commissioner Fox's motion to terminate and search for an alternate hearings officer for the North, was seconded by Commissioner Sánchez and unanimously approved.

Commissioner Fox's motion to terminate Ms. Cartwright's contract and search for a hearings officer for the South, was seconded by Commissioner Sánchez and unanimously approved.

Commissioner Fox's motion to extend Mr. Hussey's contract for another 2 years was seconded by Commissioner Sánchez.

It was clarified that the cases of Mr. Egghart and Ms. Cartwright, which have not been heard, would be reassigned and rescheduled. The cases in which Mr. Egghart and Ms. Cartwright were in the process of rendering decisions would be completed during the balance of their contracts.

**X. Special Reports**

None.

**XI. Comments by the General Public**

None.

**XII. Select Date for Next Meeting**

Next meeting set for June 25, 2004, in Carson City.

**XIII. \*Adjournment**

Commissioner Sánchez's motion to adjourn the meeting at 10:52 a.m. was seconded by Commissioner Fox and unanimously approved.